

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed on June 14, 2007, the Examiner took the following action: (1) objected to claim 35 because of informalities; (2) rejected claims 2 and 7, and claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. first paragraph and second paragraph respectively; (3) rejected claims 1 & 34 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated over Bayeh (U.S. Patent no. 6,223,202) (hereinafter, "Bayeh"); and 4) rejected claims 2-3, 7-11, 13-20, and 35-37 under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Bayeh, and further in view of Benitez (U.S. App. Pub. No. US 2002/0161908) (hereinafter, "Benitez").

Applicant appreciates the examiner courtesy in the interview of October 16, 2007. In that interview applicant discusses the Bayeh reference in view of claims 1 and 34. A discussion was also presented of possible amendments to the claims to further distinguish applicant's claims in view of Bayeh. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 34 to clarify distinctions of the applicant's claims.

The amendments to claims 1 - 3, 7, 14, and 34 - 37 are simply to provide clarification and/or to correct informalities noted by the Applicant, and are not to overcome prior art or any other objections. Applicant respectfully request entry of the amended claims and reconsideration of the pending claims in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Objections

Claim 35 was objected to because a period is been missing after "URL". Claim 35 has been amended to replace the period with a comma.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 2 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for claiming subject matter not described in the specification. Claim 2 has been amended to recite:

generating a configuration store via a user-mode administrative process that includes data configured to indicate a rule defined by an administrator; and updating the configuration file based on the data included in the configuration store.

Claim 7 has been amended to recite:

The method as recited in Claim 1, wherein the request comprises a uniform resource locator (URL), the URL being hierarchical formatted; and wherein the method further comprises analyzing the hierarchical formatted URL to locate one of the plurality of directories and subdirectories in the configuration file to identify the process in the server that will handle the request.

As amended claims 2 and 7 are supported by the specification, specifically support for claim 2 is found in applicant's specification, page 17, lines 9 – 23. Support for claim 7 is found on page 15, lines 17 – 23; and page 15 lines 23 through page 16, line 14.

Claim 34 is rejected as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically claim 34 was rejected because of uncertainty if the configuration file comprises identifiers and also comprises “user-mode process indicators”. Claim 34 has been amended to provide certainty in the configuration file and now recites:

The method as recited in claim 1 wherein the configuration file comprises hierarchical identifiers and corresponding user-mode process indicators, and wherein the user-mode process indicators indicate user-mode processes that handle the request.

Claims 2, 7 and 34 have been amended to overcome the rejection by more definitely claiming what the applicant regards as the invention. Accordingly, the §112 rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Bayeh. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a method that includes:

“receiving a request from a sending device, the request comprising a hierarchical identifier;

generating a configuration file that includes a hierarchical tree-like arrangement of uniform resource locators (URLs) having a plurality of directories and one or more subdirectories associated with each of the plurality of directories, the configuration file including a user-mode processes associated with each of the URLs;

identifying the directory and the associated subdirectory in the hierarchical tree-like arrangement corresponding to the hierarchical identifier to identify an appropriate user-mode process of a server device for handling the request; and

providing the request to the identified appropriate user-mode process of the server device that handles the request by providing a response for transmission to the sending device.”

Bayeh does not disclose this method. Bayeh discloses comparing the URL in a request with one or more URL masks (Column 8, lines 36-46). Applicant, unlike Bayeh, includes configuration file that includes a hierarchical tree-like arrangement. Applicant receives a request having a hierarchical identifier, and

identifies the directory and associated directory corresponding to the identifier to identify the appropriate user-mode server process.

Claim 34 is allowable because it is depended on independent amended claim 1 which is allowable. Further claim 34 has been amended to recite a method where “the configuration file comprises hierarchical identifiers and corresponding user-mode process indicators, and wherein the user-mode process indicators indicate user-mode processes that handle the request.”

Bayeh does not disclose this method. Bayeh discloses a URL mask. Applicant, unlike Bayeh, includes a configuration file with hierarchical identifiers that indicate user-modes processes. Using a URL mask rather than hierarchical identifiers may increase the time to determine the process to handle a request as more records in the configuration file may have to be searched. As this feature is not shown or suggested by the cited reference, this claim is now allowable.

To summarize, Bayeh does not disclose “generating a configuration file that includes a hierarchical tree-like arrangement of uniform resource locators (URLs) having a plurality of directories and one or more subdirectories associated with each of the plurality of directories,” as required by amended claim 1 and “the configuration file comprises hierarchical identifiers and corresponding user-mode process indicators,” as required by amended claim 34. Thus, claim 1 and 34, as amended, is allowable over Bayeh and the §102 rejection should be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §103 Claim Rejections

Claims 2-3, 7-11, 13-20, and 35-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over Bayeh, and further in view of Benitez (*Office Action p.3-p.8*). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claim 13 recites:

“A computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing steps comprising:

causing a request generated by a client device to be received in a server device using a kernel-mode process, the request comprising a hierarchical identifier associated with a client device;

causing the kernel-mode process to compare the hierarchical identifier with at least a portion of a configuration file to identify a most applicable user-mode process for handling the client device generated request within the server device; and

causing the kernel-mode process to provide the client device generated request to the identified most applicable user-mode process that will provide a response to the request for the client device.”

Bayeh and/or Benitez do not teach or suggest the combination of feature(s) recited in claim 13. For example, Bayeh and/or Benitez do not teach or suggest “causing a request generated by a client device to be received in a server device using a kernel-mode process” or “provide the client device generated request to the identified most applicable user-mode process that will provide a response to the request for the client device”.

Neither Bayeh and/or Benitez recite causing a request generated by a client device to be received in a server using a *kernel mode process* (emphasis added). Bayeh does not disclose a kernel mode process. Further Benitez shows a kernel and user mode process on a client, but does not disclose a kernel and user mode process on a server. In addition Benitez does not show causing a request to be

received in a server using the kern-mode process that is then handled by a user mode process. Information in Benitez is handled by a user-mode process then routed to a kernel. Finally neither of the references show or suggest handling a hierarchical identifier. Bayeh uses a URL mask to identify a process, not a hierarchical identifier.

Accordingly, claim 13 is allowable over the Bayeh-Benitez combination for at least the reasons described above, and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2-3, 7-11, 34 - 35 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 1. Accordingly, the §103 rejection should be withdrawn. Further amended claim 2 is allowable for independent reasons, specifically amended claim 2 recites:

The method as recited in Claim 1, further comprising:
generating a configuration store via a user-mode administrative process that includes data configured to indicate a rule defined by an administrator; and
updating the configuration file based on the data included in the configuration store.

The Bayeh-Benitez combination does not show or suggest a configuration store that includes data configured to indicate rules, nor does it update a configuration file based on the data in the configuration store. By updated the configuration file based on the data in the configuration store, the kernel mode process can be changed to add new rules. Accordingly, the §103 rejection of claim 2 should be withdrawn.

Also amended claim 7 is allowable for independent reasons, specifically amended claim 7 recites:

The method as recited in Claim 1, wherein the request comprises a uniform resource locator (URL), the URL being hieratical formatted; and wherein the method further comprises analyzing the hieratical formatted URL to locate one of the plurality of directories and subdirectories in the configuration file to identify the process in the server that will handle the request.

The Bayeh-Benitez combination does not show or suggest analyzing the hieratical formatted URL to locate directories and sub-directories in the configuration file. Bayeh discusses using a URL mask which to find a match URL, but does not contain directories and subdirectories. By using directories and subdirectories, applicant is able to locate the relevant process to handle the request rather than having to search through a plurality of URLs. Further applicant avoids the problem of which process to handle the request when a URL possibly matches two or more URL masks. Accordingly, the §103 rejection of claim 7 should be withdrawn.

Claims 14 – 20 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 13 (either directly or indirectly). Accordingly, the §103 rejection of claims 14 – 20 should be withdrawn.

Claim 37 is allowable by virtue of its dependency upon claim 36. Further amended claim 37 is allowable for independent reasons. Specifically amended claim 37 recites:

The method as recited in claim 36 wherein the request comprises a uniform resource locator (URL) that includes the hierarchical identifier, wherein the configuration file contains elements stored as a tree-like arrangement and wherein identifying the directory and the associated subdirectory corresponding to the hierarchical identifier comprises walking through directories and subdirectories in the tree-like arrangement of URLs in the configuration file to find best match to the hierarchical identifier or to reject the request if there is not a match.

Neither Bayeh nor Benitez reference shows or suggests walking through a tree-like arrangement of URLs in a configuration file. A URL mask in Bayeh is not stored in a tree like arrangement. Accordingly, the §103 rejection of claim 37 should be withdrawn.

Cancelled Claims

Claim 9 has been cancelled.

New Claims

New claim 38 is presented for examination. Based on the above discussion regarding Bayeh and Benitez claims 38 is also allowable. Additionally, claim 38 is allowable by virtue of its dependency upon claim 37.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request entry of this amendment, entry of new claim 38, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-3, 7-8, 10-11, 13-20, and 34-38 and allowance of same. If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: December 14, 2007

By: _____

Steven C. Stewart
Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Reg. No. 33,555
(206) 315-7909